

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed May 23, 2005.

Claim Status:

Claims 18-40 were pending in the application prior to entry of the present amendment.

Claims 18-40 remain pending.

Rejections Under Section 103

Claims 18-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kipping et al. (USPN 6831660; hereinafter referred to as Kipping) in view of Narayanaswami (USPN 5883634).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 18-40.

Claim 18 recites:

- A method for comparing a pixel location against a plurality of windows, the method comprising:

- passing the pixel location through a plurality of clip circuits, wherein the clip circuits are connected in a series to form a pipeline, and wherein each clip circuit is a segment of the pipeline;

- computing a window result in each clip circuit for the pixel location, wherein each clip circuit is provided data defining a different one of the plurality of windows, wherein the window result comprises an indication of inclusion of the pixel location within the corresponding one of the plurality of windows;

- outputting the pixel location and a window word from each clip circuit, wherein said outputting comprises, passing the pixel location and the window word directly to a next clip circuit in the series of clip circuits except for the last clip circuit in the series, and wherein the window word also comprises any previous window results; and

- examining the window word output by the last clip circuit in the series of clip circuits to determine if the pixel is included in at least one of the windows.

Kipping and Narayanaswami either singly or in combination do not teach or render obvious “the clip circuits are connected in a series to form a pipeline, and wherein each clip circuit is a segment of the pipeline”. In fact, Kipping and Narayanaswami are silent on “the clip circuits are connected in a series to form a pipeline, and wherein each clip circuit is a segment of the pipeline”.

In addition, Kipping and Narayanaswami either singly or in combination do not teach or render obvious “outputting the pixel location and a window word from each clip circuit, wherein said outputting comprises, passing the pixel location and the window word directly to a next clip circuit in the series of clip circuits”. In fact, Kipping and Narayanaswami are silent on “the clip circuits are connected in a series to form a pipeline”.

Narayanaswami does teach in col. 3, lines 28-35:

“The problem of overlapping windows is shown in FIG. 3(a). Window A 302 overlaps window B 304 obscuring part of window B. An application writing to window B must detect overlap and write only to the visible area. The present invention implements a clipping window 305 as shown in FIG. 3(b). Clipping window 305 has the same dimensions as window B. The visible portion of window B contains a binary 1 in all pixel positions 306 while the obscured portion contains binary 0s 308. The use of reversed binary values (0=visible and 1=obscured) or non-binary values is also possible in alternate embodiments. The clipping window for each window is maintained in system memory 104 for ready update and access.”

In addition, Kipping and Narayanaswami either singly or in combination do not teach or render obvious “the window word also comprises any previous window results”. In fact, Narayanaswami teaches as noted above “the visible portion of window B contains a binary 1 in all pixel positions 306 while the obscured portion contains binary 0s”.

Furthermore, Kipping and Narayanaswami either singly or in combination do not teach or render obvious “examining the window word output by the last clip circuit in the series of clip circuits to determine if the pixel is included in at least one of the windows”. In fact,

Narayanaswami teaches as quoted above “An application writing to window B must detect overlap and write only to the visible area”. Narayanaswami teaches passing a pixel on only if it is visible in a particular window being processed.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 18 and its dependent claims are non-obvious and patentably distinguished over Kipping and Narayanaswami for at least the reasons given above.

Applicant further submits that the independent claims 26 and 34 and their dependent claims are also non-obvious and patentably distinguished over Kipping and Narayanaswami for at least the reasons given above in support of claim 18.

CONCLUSION


Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5181-84600/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☒ Notice of Change of Address

Respectfully submitted,



Mark K. Brightwell
Reg. No. 47,446
AGENT FOR APPLICANT

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: Aug 23, 2005 MKB/JWC